

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX.

NEW YORK, APRIL 15, 1854.

NO. 8.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS—One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"GREAT PROJECTS OF FRANCE."

Such is the topic on which a tract writer in England speaks in one of a series of tracts being issued in that country. His speculations are quite interesting, though not altogether reliable, we think. There are some points in it, however, which are facts already existing or highly probable soon to be realized. These facts convince us more than ever that the Napoleon Dynasty is the Scarlet Colored Beast, Rev. 17. We have concluded to give some extracts from the tract.—ED. EX.

The Deep and Deadly man who occupies the throne of France, is still the same silent and impenetrable being that he was at first, and requires to be watched and guarded against more carefully than before. With consummate wisdom and dissimulation, no sooner had he secured the empire, than he proclaimed "Peace," and subsided into his former apathy and quiescence. So far he has exhibited that serpent-like character which we ascribed to him after the revolution of 1851:—unfolding himself for a sudden spring, and then recoiling back within his folds, to prepare for a future and equally violent attack.

Ever since December, 1849, we have endeavored to point out, in these pages, the misconception under which most men labored as to the real character of Louis Napoleon. While almost every one pronounced him little better than an idiot, we expressed a conviction of his capacity, and directed attention, especially to one feature of his mind, which is always a proof of some formidable and powerful quality—the gradual development of his character. A man who gradually develops himself, according to the circumstances of the moment, is always, in a greater or less degree, powerful and formidable. This quality we discovered and pointed out in Louis Napoleon ever since 1849; and it must be admitted that his subsequent career has more than justified what was said. His progress ever since has been more rapid and vigorous than we had reason to expect; and, therefore, we may be entitled to ask for some attention to our present remarks.

Immediately after the famous *coup d'etat* of December, 1851, the English press commenced a violent attack upon the present Emperor of France.

No language was too strong, no terms of vituperation were too gross, to be applied to him. Even those who condescended to accept an invitation to his table were assailed, by a writer in the *Times*, under the signature of "An Englishman," with a degree of ferocity which, being *anonymous*, was as cowardly as it was brutal. Having secured the throne, his majesty issued a manifesto of "universal peace," and subsided into apparent apathy and inertness. This unexpected moderation produced a change in popular opinion; and those who execrated him as king "Stork," were willing to hold him up to public admiration as king "Log." After awhile the ambition of the Emperor Nicholas began to awaken apprehensions of a mighty convulsion in the East; and knowing that we could not depend upon the treacherous professions of Austria, or the King of Prussia, we became sorely perplexed in looking about for an ally upon the Eastern question. The whole of Europe had been alienated from us (most justly) by the petty meddling of Lord Palmerston, who encouraged revolutionists everywhere to take up arms, and then, when they were defeated, left them to be shot or hanged, without attempting to interfere for them! This ignoble policy had turned all parties against us, both constitutionalists and revolutionists; while the consummate skill and deep-designing genius of Louis Napoleon had so dexterously contrived it, that the same individual who overturned the republics, both of France and Rome, was looked up to as their supreme patron by the revolutionists of Europe; while he was equally respected by constitutional sovereigns, for having crushed down the spirit of revolution! How these two conflicting merits could meet together in one person—how the same man could be, at once, the patron of revolutionists and of despots, none can account for but the author of all evil, by whom the capacity was given. But it shows us the reed that we lean upon, when we attempt to oppose our British statesmen to the subtlety and genius of Louis Napoleon. Lord Palmerston, an incessant talker, who managed to injure and offend all parties on the continent, is a most unequal antagonist to Louis Napoleon; who, without opening his lips more than once a year, has contrived to make himself the friend of all, and the arbiter of the destinies of half the world.

It is with this deep and deadly man that we have been compelled to form an alliance, for the simple reason that our foreign secretary had disgusted *all*, without being of service to *any*; and now we must either take up arms against half the world, or hang our prosperity upon the caprice or fidelity of Napoleon. Should we break off our alliance with him, we have no ally left upon the face of the earth, nor upon the face of the water either. * *

Our public journals, after the greatest abuse and insult heaped upon Louis Napoleon, have lately discovered that he is one of the best of men!—our first ally and sincerest friend! From mean abuse they have descended to still meaner sycophancy. The “Standard” taking the lead, as usual, in every act of unworthiness. Because he has not made war upon Europe before this time—because he has acted with common sense for his own purposes—he is supposed to have changed his nature and to have become a model of virtue. The Ethiopian has enveloped himself in the white robes of innocence (borrowed for an hour), and we fancy that he himself has become white. Meantime, while the public press is defending itself by sycophancy, our unhappy statesmen are perplexed “in the extreme.” They dare not announce their suspicions of Louis Napoleon, nor break off the alliance; yet they know, perfectly well, that his whole object, at this day, is nothing but self-aggrandizement. They know that he is making use of the British alliance and the British fleet to extend the power and dominions of France. He is making a weapon out of the simplicity of the British nation, with which he will cut his way to a second empire (in the East.) He has already played with the French nation, as if they were children. Statesmen, men of science, soldiers, and even great commanders, he has outreached and outwitted them all: thus he has gained one empire already. He has equally outwitted the subtle conclave of the Vatican; and under the name of protector, he has made himself the master both of Rome and the Pontiff—while he now and then amuses the world with the rumor of the withdrawal of his garrison from Rome. He is now preparing to overreach, in the same manner, both England and the Sultan, and to check-mate even Russia herself, with all her diplomatic astuteness. He has reduced politics to a game of “fool in the middle,” on a grand scale—he has occupied the French corner of Europe in his own person—he has got one of his generals into the Roman corner—and his next move will be to get another general (with an army) into the corner of Constantinople; while England will be left, with outstretched hands and astonished eyes, as *Fool in the Middle*. Such is the game of the master politician of the age!

We may be assured that the embarrassment of our situation is as well known to foreign powers as the amount of our national debt; and upon this knowledge they are acting. Russia has been encouraged by it to make her advances upon Turkey; and Louis Napoleon, we need not doubt, has weighed it in his mind, and has shaped his schemes accordingly. His object in forming so strict an alliance with England, is nothing less than to convert our ships, men, and treasures, into the instruments of his ambition. Russia has seized the Principalities—the British and French fleets enter the Bosphorus. This is the first step in the skillful march of his ambition, yet nothing seems more natural and correct. The Turkish fleet has been destroyed at Sinope; it is quite natural that the allied fleets should advance from the Bosphorus to the Euxine. There is nothing suspicious in that second move! By and by Russia will threaten to

cross the Danube, and to advance by land upon Constantinople. But an advance by land can only be prevented by a military force—a fleet can do nothing. We have not a regiment to spare—we have only a naval force at our command. Our kind and faithful ally has more troops than he can pay: he will offer to send about 70,000 men to Constantinople, merely to prevent its being occupied by the Russians. Nothing is more natural! If we can spare no land forces, our ally, France, must send a double amount, both for us and for herself. But we are acting in a joint alliance, and as we cannot spare men, we are bound, in honor, to contribute money. France will send a double amount of troops, which she can afford; and we shall contribute a double amount of money, which France cannot afford. Nothing can be more natural! With our money, and his own troops, Louis Napoleon will occupy a most agreeable position—he will occupy Constantinople with a force entirely devoted to himself, paid (one half) with English money; while the British fleet will continue in the Turkish waters, doing one half the work of keeping the Russian fleet in check, without being able to interfere, in the slightest degree, with the military occupation of Constantinople. Nothing can be more natural and reasonable than all this! One step follows directly from the other—one move necessitates the other. No one can find fault with Louis Napoleon, or accuse him of the slightest assumption; he is only discharging his duty as a faithful ally! But the result of his fidelity will be this:—That he will become master of Constantinople, with our concurrence, our assistance, and our money! and we shall find ourselves the passive instruments of another man's ambition—raising our bitterest enemy to uncontrollable power. * *

Observe with what consummate skill Louis Napoleon has managed with respect to Rome. He has got absolute possession of the capital of the Roman Church—he is master of the Pope, and conclave of Cardinals. The life and property of all are in his hands. He has conquered Rome herself as effectually as ever Rome conquered any province of the ancient world, and yet he has escaped all the dangers and responsibilities of conquest. No one can charge him with ambition; he was only assisting the Holy Father to regain his throne! Excellent son of the Church! Truly his most Christian majesty! No one can charge him with disturbing the balance of power, by getting military possession of the capital of Italy—he was putting down revolution, and setting up the Holy Catholic faith. Exemplary saint! Ah! if all who have had as much power had but used it with so much disinterestedness! But, for all that, he is absolute master of central Italy, and of the capital of Christendom; which even the most ambitious might consider a splendid acquisition. In the same innocent manner—with the same love of peace—with the same simple-hearted desire of doing good, he will take Constantinople and the Bosphorus under his special protection. And, so little ambitious is he of praise, he will allow the British fleet to co-operate in the good work, and to share the renown; but, having an army as well as a fleet, he will have all the substantial power. In short, he will become

master of the capital of Islamism, and of the most important military position in the world—as he is now master of the capital of Christendom—and yet will so carry out his schemes, that he will appear, all the time, to be doing a most virtuous action—an act of pure benevolence, that will earn him the praises of the silly “Standard,” and of all who are so unwise as to judge men by their actions, without looking to their motives. Having got possession of Constantinople as a protector, no one can find fault with him; he has not gained it by conquest, but by permission of the Sultan himself. He has not destroyed the balance of power in Europe! not he! he is only trying to keep Russia from destroying it! But, for all that, he will hold in his hands the keys of Italy and the East—the strongest military positions in the world—the most important of all naval positions; and the capitals of the Eastern and Western empires: and all this as a friend and ally—as a man of pure benevolence and disinterested fidelity! By peace he shall destroy many; and what is more, they *will thank him for destroying them!* He will hold the knife to the throat of Europe and Asia with such suavity of features—such tenderness of expression—such softness of speech, that the nearer he brings the knife, the more will they cry out in his praise and extol his benevolence! He has already conquered detraction both in France and England—he has buried all his real enormities under an heap of apparent public services, and is now universally praised where, two years ago, he was universally execrated. We are sorry to say that the English press has been guilty of this double ignominy; first, that of reviling him far more than he, at the time, deserved; and now, of praising him still more than it once reviled him. The same course of weakness will continue to the last; every fresh advance that he will make to universal empire, he will so bewilder the public eye, that after appearing as a demon for an instant, he will, a moment after, be transformed into an angel of light. * * * * *

Having got possession of both Rome and Constantinople under the name of PROTECTOR, it will then be the easiest thing possible to carry his immense projects into execution—to restore first, and then to extend the empire of Napoleon. Not only to restore the empire, but even to realize the very *thoughts* of his great predecessor—to accomplish in facts what the first Napoleon only contemplated in dreams! It will be impossible for England to quarrel with or obstruct him, for he will act, in every case, under the pacific title of PROTECTOR. He is now master of Rome, yet no one dreams of going to war with him, as he is only the protector of the Pope. He will be master of Constantinople under the same pacific disguise. The Pope invited his assistance, and now, too late, discovers that he is but the vassal of his ally. The same fate will befall the Sultan, and every other power that invites his assistance. Having secured the grand military position of Constantinople, it will then be time to carry out the favorite project of the great Napoleon—the object of his earliest passion in the first flush and glory of his genius. The Eastern Empire was Napoleon's first love, never to be forgotten amidst all the successes of his maturity.

And Napoleon the Third has long determined to execute his uncle's designs to the utmost letter. From Constantinople, therefore, he will steal his way along the classic shores of Asia Minor—by the Hellespont, of an hundred songs—by the tomb of Achilles—by the fields of Troy—by the birth-place of Homer—by the undying ruins of the Ionian coast—by old Damascus—by the deserted beach of Tyre and Sidon—by Acre, red with the bravest blood of a thousand years—beneath the sacred shadows of Lebanon and Carmel, until the little cloud, no larger than a hand, has spread over all the sky, and the heavens have become black with abundance of rain. In plain words, he will creep artfully along from Constantinople to Syria, and from Syria to the Holy Land—he will become *protector* of them all. Having kindly begun the protection of the Sultan, why should he draw back? why leave half the work unfinished? Benevolence grows through exercise! His benevolence will extend itself to every province of Asiatic Turkey (which he happens to wish for;) and, in the exercise of this generous quality, he will become master of the East from the Bosphorous to the Arabian desert, and across, from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates. Once he has taken the first step, the rest will be a matter of course; and all may be done quietly, and without bloodshed, for he will appear as a protector. Virtue has its reward even in this world. By means of this virtue and its reward, he will realize the wildest dreams of the great Napoleon; and possess, in fact, what the other scarcely imagined in hope. And having extended his *protection* to the Euphrates, he will have entered upon the theatre of the FIRST prophetic empire—upon that of the golden head—the empire of Nebuchadnezzar. Such are, at this moment, his splendid schemes—the way is opening to their execution; and never was so great a scheme committed to so masterly a hand. * * * * *

But what we have now stated does not constitute the whole amount of Louis Napoleon's projects. He has fixed his eyes upon ITALY as well as the East; and, having occupied the central position of Rome, he can spread his snares around, until he has made himself master of the entire peninsula. The revolutionists of Italy are devoted to his service and his name; and the recollection of the imperial splendors of the first Napoleon will place upon his head (as on that of his predecessor) the iron crown of Lombardy. He will, inevitably, be king of Italy. Nor is even this all—he has extended his machinations to another peninsula.—SPAIN is slowly, but surely, falling into his hands. The shameless profligacy of the queen—the close connection which he has formed with the Spanish people, by the consummate policy of his marriage—the Spanish pride, gratified by that connection, all tend to the same point, to effect a revolution in the Spanish government, which will make him master of Spain, as well as of Italy. Every event of the day—every false step of others—the ambition of Nicholas—the imbecility of Pius the IX.—the frailty of Isabella—all the deeds and misdeeds of others, accumulate their force, and heap power and prosperity upon his head; while he himself, silent and impenetrable, amuses the frivolous world by an

exaggeration of frivolity, yet watches every opportunity with the coolest judgment, and seizes every advantage with a grasp that nothing has ever shaken off. Believe us, that it is not Russia, nor the Pope, nor even France, that we are to fear—but it is the Emperor of France, and the NAME OF NAPOLEON, that overshadows the world—and will, hereafter, overwhelm the whole system of CHRISTENDOM!

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS AN EXAMPLE.—BY J. PANTON HAM.

[Continued from page 86.]

We may here introduce, as corroborative of our previous remarks, the following passage from the Epistle to the Colossians: "Whereof I Paul am made a minister; who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." The popular commentator, Albert Barnes, has so well expressed the meaning of this verse, that we cannot do better than quote his words, especially as he has the credit of being an "orthodox" writer. The somewhat obscure form of expression—"fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ," Mr. Barnes expounds thus: "That which I lack of coming up to the sufferings which Christ endured in the cause of the church." Here Mr. Barnes clearly perceives that Paul wished to be so conformed to the likeness of Christ, that he desired to have a common experience with him in every respect, even in his sufferings—as also he elsewhere expresses, "that I may know him, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death."—Phil. 3:10. The apostle does not mean that there was any imperfection in Christ's sufferings which he, or any one else, could supply, as the Romanists profanely teach, but that there was as yet imperfection in his own measure of sufferings in behalf of the church, and that as yet he fell short of the standard which Christ's sufferings in behalf of the church displayed, and which was erected for the example of his people. "For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps." "The apostle seems to mean," continues Mr. Barnes, "that he suffered in the same cause as that for which Christ suffered; that he endured the same kind of sufferings, to some extent, in reproaches, persecutions, and oppositions from the world; that he had not yet suffered as much as Christ did in this cause, and though he had suffered greatly, yet there was much that was lacking, to make him equal in this respect to the Savior; and that he felt it was an object to be earnestly desired to be made in all respects just like Christ, and that in his present circumstances he was fast filling up that which was lacking, so that he would have a more complete resemblance to him. What he says here is based on the leading desire of his soul—the great principle of his life—to BE JUST LIKE CHRIST: alike in moral character, in suffering, and in destiny." He concludes his note by saying, "this seems to me to be the fair meaning of this expression, though not the one commonly given. The usual interpretation is, 'that

which remains to me of affliction to be endured in the cause of Christ.' But this seems to me to be cold and tame, and not to suit the genius of Paul.* The apostle could not use more plain and more emphatic language to convey his views of the principle of Christ's sufferings. In his view they were *exemplary*, not *expiatory*. He could not have believed that they had an expiatory character, or he never would have compared his own sufferings with those of his Master, and desired even in the experience of sufferings and death "to be just like Christ." It is in harmony with this view of the sufferings of Christ, but not surely with the popular view, that Paul should thus write to the Corinthian church, "for as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ."

In the light of this very obvious and scriptural view of the sufferings of Christ, we see the greater appropriateness and force of that scripture exhortation to take up the Cross and follow Christ,— "if any man will be my disciple, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." This language was addressed by our Lord to his disciples

* Dr. Adam Clarke strives to evade the force of this text by the following hypercriticism:—"It is worthy of remark, that the apostle does not say *pathemata*, the passion of Christ, but simply *thlipseis*, the afflictions; such as are common to all good men who bear testimony against the ways and fashions of a wicked world. In these the apostle had his share—in the passion of Christ he could have none." So says Dr. Adam Clarke, but Paul has spoken for himself, and has flatly contradicted the learned divine:—"That I may know him . . . and the fellowship (or participation) of his sufferings," (*pathemata* in the genitive plural.) Again, "for as the sufferings (*pathemata*) of Christ abound in us." Again, "rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings" (*pathemata*),—1 Peter 4:13, and elsewhere. Surely the doctor could not have been ignorant of the fact that *pathema* and *thlipsis* are exchangeable terms. The Greek scholar may see a proof of this in 2 Corinth. 1:6. Indeed the verse before us supplies an example, for *pathema* is the word which the apostle uses in the former part of the verse, "my sufferings for you," which is clearly of the same verbal value as "*afflictions*" in the latter part of the verse. Dr. Macknight tries to get out of the difficulty by a different piece of gratuitous criticism. "The phrase 'afflictions of Christ,' in this passage, being the genitive of the agent, signifies, not the afflictions which Christ suffered, but the afflictions which he appointed the apostle to suffer for building the church." On what ground does the learned doctor deny that this phrase is the genitive of possession? Not on a grammatical, but on an exegetical ground. Its interpretation as a genitive of possession makes against the popular theology, hence with a license, not uncommon among theological grammarians, Dr. Macknight gratuitously asserts that it is "the genitive of the agent." With as much grammatical reason might he assert that 1 Peter 5:1, Romans 8:18, where the phrases "sufferings of Christ," and "sufferings of this present time" occur, are examples of "the genitive of the agent," as the phrase "afflictions of Christ," in Col. 1:24, for the grammatical construction is the same.

under the following circumstances:—For the first time Jesus informed his disciples that he would be delivered up into the hands of wicked men, and would be put to a violent death. The ardent and affectionate Peter exclaimed, “this be far from thee, Lord, this shall not happen to thee!” He did not perceive how much impiety his words expressed, and hence his Lord’s stern rebuke, “Get thee behind me Satan, thou art an offence unto me, for thou savorest not the things which be of God, but those which be of men.” And then followed the declaration—“If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and *take up his cross*, and follow me.” As if our Lord had said, “I will not shrink from the consequences of duty, however painful and extreme they may be, as your words, Peter, seem to counsel. If my resistance of sin, my maintenance of a perfect righteousness, and my devotion to the ends of my heavenly mission shall cost me my life, then I am prepared to ‘resist’ sin even ‘unto blood,’—I will be ‘obedient even unto death.’ And I say unto you, my disciples, if you, or any man will follow me, he must be prepared for a similar fate and a similar faithfulness. ‘The servant is not greater than his master; if they have persecuted me they will also persecute you, if they have kept my saying they will keep yours also.’ You must, like me, for duty’s sake, deny yourself and take up your cross, if you will follow me.” On the theory of popular christianity, this language is singularly strange and inconsistent. The cross of the “orthodox” churches is the symbol of ideas exclusively identified with Christ as the fulfiller in behalf of the human race, of a mission, which the moral government of God demanded, and which they could not fulfil themselves. It symbolizes the competency to do and suffer, what Divine justice made indispensable to the forgiveness of men’s sins and their acceptance with God, but for which mankind are wholly incompetent. Its voice is the voice of sin visited vicariously with Divine vengeance;—of justice asserting and receiving through a substitute, the satisfaction of its claims. In this view it sustains no other relation to mankind than that of a scheme of Divine benefaction. Man may gaze thereon—he is called upon to acquiesce and hope therein—but he must not touch. He must stand far off, and smite upon his breast in trembling and trustful awe. “Christ alone can touch the cross—he alone can ‘take up’ the cross, because he alone can express its significance and fulfill its conditions. The cross may be man’s hope, but not his *heritage*. And yet the christianity of the New Testament makes it his *inheritance*! According to Christ’s teaching and that of his apostles, man himself must *have a cross*—and “*take up his cross*”—and “bear his cross,” and endure his cross! Man, like his great model, must be “crucified to the world”—he must take up his cross daily, and follow or imitate his crucified Lord. He must “*suffer with*” Christ, if he hopes to “reign with” him. But man cannot become a substitute for the sins of the world, endure the pressure of omnipotent wrath, give satisfaction to Divine justice! Then how can he “take up his cross and follow” Christ? How can he “suffer with” Christ? The popular theory again fails. In the view of this scripture require-

ment it stands in obvious contrast, and consequent condemnation. The idea of *expiation* cannot enter into its doctrinal significance, for only on the supposition that Christ bore his cross as the world’s wicked recompense of his perfect righteousness, can the sons of men be called upon to *take up their cross, imitate, and suffer with him*.

The language of Paul in his epistle to the Philippians, ch. 3 : 10, is very explicit, and decisive of the point at issue. The apostle gloried that he had “suffered the loss of all things” for Christ, because those sufferings gave him a *common experience* with Christ. His great ambition was “the excellency of the *knowledge* of Christ Jesus” his Lord, hence he says, “I count all things but loss . . . that I may *know* him (by having a similar experience) and the *fellowship* of his sufferings, being made *conformable to his death*.” If Christ’s “sufferings” and “death” were *expiatory*, how could Paul suppose that his sufferings could be in “fellowship” with those of Christ, and his death be “conformable to,” or resemble Christ’s death? And yet this is what he does suppose and desire. He gloried in his sufferings for righteousness’ sake, because he was thus enabled to “*know*” Christ more intimately and experimentally, whose sufferings were endured in like manner. And should he die in testifying for the gospel of Christ, he would “suffer *with*” Christ, and his death would be “conformable unto,” or in resemblance of Christ’s death. Such is obviously the force of his language, and in conformity with the same sentiment he speaks of, believers generally, as “planted together in the *likeness* of his (Christ’s) death.” The experience of Christ and his disciples is one in principle when they suffer for righteousness’ sake, and one in actual fact, when, like their master, their uncompromising fidelity costs them their life’s blood. Then they drink of the cup that he drank of, and are baptized with the baptism wherewith he was baptized.

A DISCLAIMER.

BY C. F. HUDSON.

CINCINNATI, April 3, 1854.

DEAR BR. STORRS—I must confess to a little disappointment since I wrote to you; and, confiding in your honor and integrity as a Christian brother, I will, without much prologue, plunge “*in medias res*,” and state my position, and the grievances to which, undesignedly, you are subjecting me.

I stated, in my letter to Br. Chittenden (whose name was given me by a friend) that, for certain reasons, I had stood aloof from the Storrs’ movement. Those reasons were as follows:—By means of a copy of the “Storrs’ Miscellany,” I obtained a list of your publications, some of which I sent for. Although they contained some unanswerable arguments, still I did not, on the whole, like them. The “*Anthropos*” of your Miscellany seemed to me too true to his *nomme de plume*; and his argument left him, I thought, too much at the mercy of the mere anthropologist. Friend Read, on the “Immateriality of the Soul,” seemed to me to prove its Insubstantiality as much as anything else. And the pamphlets I received seemed to me to tend

clearly to materialistic views. I was inclined also to criticise the tone and temper of some of the writers, though knowing their position as somewhat slandered, I could forgive a good deal in that way. And yet I could not but say, these publications will convince mainly the disaffected, and those ready to quarrel with orthodoxy; and the style of belief which grows out of this branch of the movement will be negative rather than positive, as has been the whole Unitarian and Universalist movement. And among a large class of the best sort of Christian people, I could not more effectually confirm the common doctrine, than by circulating these books, on the principle of counter irritation.

And thus, knowing the tendencies of a heterodox position, and that a breach with the Church visible may be followed by wild and radical error, I was not prepared to dispute the assertion when I heard the strangest things said of Br. Storrs: things which of course added to my deep regret at the unwise and indefensible position of so many of my brethren. I had no doubt but for the apparent drifting of many of them towards materialism, I should have met a less summary fate at the hands of my Association,—though other influences, clearly observable, set in to hasten them to an unwarranted judgment. That, however, is between me and them.

I was undeceived of these strange reports, and inclined to a more hopeful view of your course, by reading your Hartford Convention speech, and by what Br. V. told me of you. And writing to Br. C., and failing to hear from him, I wrote to you as I did. Your letter in reply made me still more hopeful.

But some things in the style of the EXAMINER for March 1, which I received shortly after, were not to my taste, and I was prepared to feel injustice done me by your issue of March 15. And, finally, looking over the numbers for January and February, I am more desponding than ever. And for reasons briefly thus:

My letter was on the whole a private letter; and although I gave you a kind of implied liberty to publish the "copies" I sent you, anonymously, I stated expressly that my book was in no state for proclamation. And then my school and other private schemes were my own rather than the people's.

Again, the portion of my letter which you have published is just that which is least theological; and of the rest, which your letter takes special notice of, nothing is said or intimated in your paper. If you did not think it worth while to publish my criticisms (and I had no claim upon your doing so), you should at least not ignore them in such a way as to put me in a false position. This I think you have done.

For I do dissent, *in toto*, from the materialistic view which I find to pervade your paper. And although you and your contributors do sincerely disclaim the epithet of "materialists," and are as far as need be from the materialism of the Deist or the Atheist, still you do, as I conceive, hold a position that is philosophically difficult, and utterly untenable and unrequired by the Divine Word.—As brethren in Christ, and holding the same hope

of eternal life, I can heartily welcome you, and bid you God speed. But as philosophers and interpreters, I must predict you ill success,—and must advise you that you have unwittingly wronged me, by not stating my dissent from your philosophy of the nature of the soul. Even on the lower ground of expediency, I have a right to ask that you should not compromise the little influence I may have with some who have heretofore regarded me as capable of analysis. I know, indeed, that between two fires, I shall come forth the brighter, if I am sound and unhurt; for, on the other hand, I have some suspicions of rationalism to outlive, and am willing to bide my time to dispel them. Hence the matter of *expediency* is one for which I care but little. But it is my *right*, and the cause of truth demands, that I should not be involved in a view from which I expressly dissent; for though I do not charge upon you the *inferences* which I draw, and which others are drawing, from your views, still my disclaimer of your premises is the only thing that can set me fair, before multitudes whom I would fain persuade to trust in Christ, as the only and gracious author of eternal being to man, by the sacrifice and redemption he has made.

The points on which I dissent from what I observe to be the tenor of many of your contributions, would be raised by one or two questions—on which I might express my views, if time permitted, viz.:

IS THE SOUL MATERIAL?

Is there in the universe no other substance besides matter?

Is the intermediate state a state of annihilation? or, are believers destroyed at death and re-created at the resurrection?

I must say, also, that the views of the redemption, which appear in the Essays on the Doctrine of the Cross, by Mr. Ham, are such as I must explicitly disown, and I have never supposed that the doctrine of Christ, as the Life-Giver, was to be carried out in such a way as to exclude the idea of Christ as a Ransom. The imperfection of our human forensic language, was never designed to give occasion for those who would deny the "Lord that bought us."

The criticisms of *taste*, of which I spoke above, are comparatively unimportant matters. I may state them at another time, if it shall seem best. Praying that the Lord of all wisdom may direct those who would establish his truth, I am yours, in the love of Christ.

C. F. HUDSON.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR:—We give place to the foregoing letter, in justice to Br. Hudson; but, in justice to ourself, we must say, that our *principal* reason for not inserting the part of his previous letter, in which he disclaimed "materialism," was, that previous to receiving the letter we had selected his communication from the Chicago paper for the EXAMINER, without abridging it, and we wished to insert the two anonymous letters he sent us, which could not well be done without an extract from the letter that accompanied them; and as those anonymous letters stated *the fact* that Br.

Hudson's views were not "materialistic," we thought that part of his letter might best be omitted; and we omitted it to abridge the space the whole would occupy. We hope this apology will exculpate us, in Br. Hudson's mind, from any intention to do him injustice; and we are sure it will.

The preceding letter we have not felt at liberty to alter or abridge. We regret having "proclaimed" Br. H.'s "book" before he designed it; that was an error in us; but if it should hasten it to its birth, our mistake may be over-ruled for good; because, if we are in error in our "materialistic" views of man, and his origin, the sooner we are set right the better for us and for all. We do not believe we are so callous yet but that we can feel the force of argument, especially if it comes with a "*Thus saith the Lord.*" Unless it is backed up with such authority it will fail of reaching our mind. If Br. H. has such authority, none will more readily or cheerfully receive it than ourself. But whether we can harmonize on that point or not, we do rejoice, and we will rejoice that he has learned that immortality, eternal life, is "the gift of God through Jesus Christ," and that "all the wicked will God destroy."

We can feel for Br. H.'s position in relation to what is called "materialism." When we first embraced the views of man's essential mortality, and indeed, up to the time we preached our Six Sermons, in 1842, we felt pained at any suggestion that our views were in any way connected with *materialism*.

There are two kinds of materialism; and of this Br. Hudson seems aware, and we trust he will be still more so after awhile. There is a materialism which denies all spiritual existence. That materialism, of course, is highly fatal to any just views of God, and must reject the possibility of a future life to man; hence it rejects the resurrection altogether. With such materialism we have no sympathy; it is purely *sensual, devilish*. But, shall we therefore reject the Scripture doctrine that the Lord God formed *man*, and every other creature that lives by breathing, on earth, "out of the dust of the ground." That is, He formed man of *matter*—made him a *material* being: and the apostle declares, "The first man is of the earth, earthy"—1 Cor. 15 : 47. And Jesus our Lord declares, in the most solemn manner, "That which is born of the flesh *is* flesh:"—John 3 : 6. Hence the necessity of being born again of the Spirit. Till that birth takes place—or, at least, till we are *begotten* again by the Spirit of God—men, any man, all men, are animal, material, and only such. But every creature on earth, that lives by breathing,

has sensation and various degrees of intelligence, according to the organism that God has seen fit to give them. It is the material organism which determines the degree of intelligence of which each creature is capable. If this is not so, let it be shown by reason, philosophy, or Scripture; especially the latter.

It is at the resurrection the followers of Christ become *spiritual*, in the full scripture sense of the term. But then they are not *immaterial*, but are in possession of "a spiritual body:"—1 Cor. 15 : 44. They are *bodies*, though spiritual. This fact, at least, demonstrates, that immateriality is not essential to spiritual. Hence a denial of *immateriality* is not a denial of scripture spirituality, though it may be a denial of *scholastic* spirituality. If Br. Hudson is disposed to "express his views" on the questions noted in the conclusion of his letter, he shall have a reasonable space in the EXAMINER to do so; at the same time we would suggest—as it would much aid us all to an understanding of the matter—that he take up a previous question, viz. :

Has the creature Man, which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, a distinct entity, above and besides, called the soul?

When this question is settled, by scripture authority, then the question of its materiality—if such a soul is found to exist—will be a legitimate one. Till then, it looks to us impossible to arrive at a satisfactory solution of Br. H.'s first question, because it would be reasoning from an *assumption* that man has that distinct entity.

As to his third question, we regard it as uncalled for in this controversy, as we know of no one who believes the "intermediate state" is "a state of annihilation," or that "believers are destroyed at death, and re-created at the resurrection." We believe that, "believers at death sleep in Jesus," and that that state is one of rest, in silence, till the voice of Christ shall call them into life, as he called Lazarus from the dead. We have no idea they are annihilated or destroyed at death; but the fact that they are not, is not because there is anything in their constitution or nature, *as men*, to prevent such a result, but because God purposes their revival from death, or sleep; and His power can accomplish what He wills, however astonishing it may seem to human minds.

One remark more. Br. Hudson certainly misapprehends Br. Ham, if he supposes he "excludes the idea of Christ as a Ransom." And we trust he will be convinced of that when he has read Br. Ham's letter in the last EXAMINER, and the remaining articles yet to appear; though we are aware Br. Hudson has not had the advantage of the

whole argument, as he has not seen, we presume, any of the articles previous to this year's EXAMINER.

In conclusion, we sincerely hope and pray that all of us who are believers in Immortality, Eternal Life *only* through Jesus Christ, may be actuated in all we say, or write, by the one desire to honor him who gave himself to suffering and sorrow, even unto death, that he might *redeem* us from *all iniquity*, thereby preparing us for *redemption* from death into Eternal Life. If we strive only for mastery, we shall verily have our reward, but that reward will not be eternal life. *Love* is the fulfilling of the law. We now "know in part" only, and are all liable to err more or less : hence, to set up our particular views as a standard, for others, and to maintain that our views are essential to be embraced, in order to life everlasting, is an assumption over the faith of others, which we think is not in harmony with that charity [*love*] which an apostle enjoined, and which Christ, our Lord and Life Giver, taught us to be the badge of discipleship.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, APRIL 15, 1854.

THE CONFLICT.

REVIEW OF PROF. MATTISON.—BY THE EDITOR.

In our last, we brought our remarks to the point where the Prof. gave us the "properties of matter," with the affirmation that "The soul of man has none of these properties." He adds :

"You cannot see or handle it : you cannot weigh or measure it. The spirit hath sensation, memory, can joy, fear and hope. Matter cannot do this."

Matter, then, however organized, cannot do any of these things. But it is perfectly manifest that any creature that lives by *breathing* can do them all : hence must have the spirit or soul the Prof. speaks of, if his theory be true. This fact he feels, and tries to escape the awkwardness of the position by saying :

"Beasts, in a certain degree, have spiritual natures ; but theirs is entombed with them, while man's continues to live on."

A spiritual nature, then, *may* be entombed. If the spiritual nature of a *sheep* may be entombed, why may not the spiritual nature of man ? for the Psalmist saith of wicked men, "*Like sheep they are laid in the grave.*"—Ps. 49 : 14 ; and again he saith, verses 12 and 20, "He is like the *beasts* that perish." Did "David in spirit" utter truth ? or shall he stand corrected by modern theology ? What evidence has the Prof. given that "man's spiritual nature continues to live on ?" He next remarks :

"You may construct a machine that will turn a last, or even make pins ; but can you give it intelligence ?"

Truly not, brother M. ; and *you* might make a "calf," as Aaron did ; but could you make it breathe or eat ? Does that prove that God could not make one that could do both ? Again, saith the Prof. :

"View a factory with its thousand spindles, each performing its allotted task almost like a thing of life. But have those spindles sensation ? consciousness ? No. Why not ? The iron in those spindles is the same which courses in my blood."

We wish friend Mattison had answered the question, "Why not ?" But as he has not, it may be proper to answer it for him. Spindles have no adaptation in their construction for the purpose of consciousness. So far as we have knowledge, there is nothing which has an adaptation to develop consciousness except that which has an organism designed to develop *life by breathing*. Why cannot a "spindle" breathe, Br. M. ? Answer that question and you answer your own. Again saith the Prof. :

"It is in the interpretation of Gen. 3 : 19, that the advocates of this new theory first stumble. That *only* which was of the dust was to return to it. But Adam was something besides dust : What did God breathe into his nostrils ? Did He blow *dust* into them ? It was the immortal soul."

Did the Lord "*blow* an immortal soul" into man's "nostrils," Br. M. ? It is easy to make a witty remark to excite a smile at an opponent ; but not so easy, always, to give proof of an assumption. Where is the evidence that God breathed an immortal soul into man's nostrils ? or any soul, mortal or immortal ? We want just one text.—The Lord God breathed the *breath* of life into his nostrils, and "*man—formed of the dust of the ground—became a living soul.*" Not, became *possessed* of an immortal soul, or any soul ; but *he—the man*, formed as described—*became a living soul.* Such is the testimony ; and when "his breath goeth forth *he* returneth to his earth : in that very day *his thoughts perish* :"—Ps. 146 : 4. His Maker and Judge said to the *man*—not to a body merely—"dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."—Gen. 3 : 19. There is no "stumbling" here on our part, Prof. : the stumbling, if any, is on the side of the *assumers* of man's inherent immortality—or man's possession of an immortal soul. In proof of the Professor's last assumption he speaks thus :

"The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit." If our spirit in this text is material, the Spirit of God must be so too. God is a spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. If the spirit worshipping be material, why not the Spirit worshipped be so too ?"

When have we ever denied that man has a spir-

it? or affirmed that that spirit is material? The question is, Is the spirit of man an entity, or a distinct being from the man? can it live and have intelligence when man has returned to dust? and is it immortal? Till you settle these points you may "blow dust" into men's eyes, but you do not touch the question at issue. "God is a Spirit," or, *spiritual*, in distinction from the Temple "at Jerusalem, where," the Jews said, "men ought to worship"—in distinction from those "*carnal* ordinances," which were to be "done away." Christ taught the woman of Samaria that God was not to be worshipped with men's hands, like the idols, or like the mere external worship of the formal Jews; but that *He* required men to give Him their *affections*, or heart: and that no service where this was lacking was a service in truth. But brother M. adds:

"The body without the spirit is dead," plainly proves that man has a living spirit within him."

The whole text reads thus: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." How does this prove man has a living spirit in him that does not die as well as the body? The fact is, whether we can "translate Hebrew or Greek" or not, the Translators have themselves inserted "*breath*," in the margin. And Dr. Adam Clarke says the marginal readings, in a majority of instances, are preferable to the text. How then does this text "prove man has a living spirit within him?" Try again, Br. M. There is nothing like trying, to show one his errors and mistakes. It seems to us you would not have traveled from Genesis almost to Revelation for proof of your theory, if you could have found it nearer the third chapter of Genesis, where you said we first stumble. You seem to have stumbled a long way to find a text, which, after all, demolishes your own theory: for Moses saith, the Lord God breathed into man's nostrils the *breath* of life and man became a living soul; and James saith, "the body without the *breath* is dead." Is the *breath* "a living conscious spirit?" If so, the spirit must be material. But our Prof. grows warm, and says:

"This worse than Universalian doctrine, would not only blot out of being all spiritual existences—not only would it make the whole of God's creation, between heaven, His throne, and earth His footstool, one vast empty space, but goes far towards obliterating the very idea of a God."

We suppose this outburst, at closing his first discourse, was intended to "warm up" the dish that it might give a relish to the performance.—But perhaps we are mistaken in the design. Universalism is in harmony with the Professor, except in the final result: and hence we should expect he

and his coadjutors would give them the preference to us, who believe immortality is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, and bestowed only on the holy, while "All the wicked will God destroy:"—Ps. 145:20. But we ask the Prof., what else His theory of spirits makes "the whole of God's creation, between heaven, His throne, and earth his footstool," but "one vast empty space?" What is a spirit, according to the Prof.? He says, It has neither *form*, *weight*, nor *color*, and CANNOT BE SEEN, felt, nor measured. Now how much "space," would any number of such fill? We think the Prof. has made a little mistake. It is *his theory* that leaves the universe of God "one vast empty space." Ours occupies it, at God's good pleasure, with substantial beings, that can be seen and felt. And we trust, by and by, to "see Jesus as he is, and be like him:"—1 John 3:2; yea, to have "our vile *body* changed, and fashioned like to his glorious *body*:"—Phil. 3:21.

We have now concluded our Review of Br. Mat-tison's first discourse, and hope we have said nothing that shall give unnecessary offence to him; presuming that his object is truth, as well as our own. May the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—our Life-Giver—lead us into all truth, and save us from all that would dishonor His name, injure His cause, or be hurtful to our dying fellow-men. Let us all remember it is but a small matter that we hold the truth, if it does not control our hearts and lives. We may hold the truth in unrighteousness. We do this when we do not give it a continual influence in all our ways; and when we so live as to give men reason to think we disregard the truths we hold. Better would it be for us not to know what truth is than having known it, to fail of conforming to it in all things.

DEFENCE OF THE BIBLE.

[The following is from our fourth speech in the Hartford Bible Convention of June last.—ED. EX.]

The great theme before this Convention is the trial of the Bible. It is said that we come here and repeat over and over again things we have said before—that we manifestly come here with nothing to say. I ask if in this respect we have differed essentially from our friends on the opposite side of the question? We labored at the outset of this Convention to see if there was a law by which the Bible could be tried, and after laboring for nearly two days we consented, for the sake of having the argument go on, that the law adduced should be the law by which the Bible should be tried, and that law was stated to be natural reli-

gion, or the God of nature. By the religion of nature, or the religion of the God of nature, the Bible and the God of the Bible are to be tried. Then I endeavored to show the congregation, last evening, that in this trial the God of the Bible suffered nothing in comparison with the God of nature; and if that was to be the rule by which the God of the Bible was to be tried, either the God of the Bible must go clear, or the God of nature was in the same condemnation. My friend Mr. Wright has felt, I have no doubt, the force of that remark; therefore he has labored very hard to acquit the God of nature, and to bring out fresh charges against the God of the Bible. The Bible, he says, represents God as ruling the world by arbitrary laws and penalties. He affirms that the God of nature does not rule the world by arbitrary laws and penalties. Am I right in saying that you affirm it?

MR. WRIGHT—Yes, I do affirm it.

MR. STORRS—Sir, what law by which the God of nature rules the world does he ever change? What penalty that the God of nature has affixed to his laws does he ever alter? If that is not arbitrary law—arbitrary penalty, I ask to know what is? One of the very charges which they bring against the God of the Bible is, that he does sometimes change his laws; therefore the law, speaking in the most absolute sense, is not arbitrary, but it is subject to be changed by the Author of that law, while the God of nature is unchanged and unchangeable in his laws and in his penalties.

MR. WRIGHT—I desire to say that I used the terms fixed laws and fixed penalties, and arbitrary laws and arbitrary penalties, as laws and penalties that are opposed to each other.

MR. STORRS—Fixed fast in fate? Then what are you but the mere machinery of the God of nature? But “the God of the Bible is a very cruel God.” The God of the Bible is represented as “commanding parents to stone the child to death. Abraham is commanded to butcher his son;” and, says my friend Wright, “I have been asked if I would do such a deed if God commanded it? No, I would not; but I would cut the throat of such a God.” Well, I was a little surprised at that remark of my good friend Wright, because, formerly, when a *follower of Jesus*, he was a peace-man—a non-resistant. (Applause.) Formerly, if a man should take his child and dash out its brains before his eyes, he would not strike him to keep him from doing it; but he has changed since he has become a worshiper of the God of nature, and is now a war-man to the knife.

MR. WRIGHT—I wish my friends to keep in mind, dis-

tinctly and emphatically, that by that form of speech I desired to show that I do not believe in the existence of any such being as a God who ever did command men to take the life of any human being. I do not believe that in cutting the throat of such a God, I would be cutting the throat of anything more than a mere metaphorical God.

MR. STORRS—I deny that the God of the Bible ever commanded Abraham to butcher his son.—He told him, indeed, to go and offer him up as a burnt-offering; but when Abraham took hold of the knife, God commanded him to stop. He had gone beyond what he told him to do. But my friend Wright will have to butcher his God, and cut his throat as sure as life; because the God of nature has given the *command* to delicate mothers, and *compelled* them to *butcher* their own children, and *eat* them too. Is it, or is it not a fact that in sieges of cities, where they have been driven to desperation for the lack of food, mothers have killed their own children, and eaten them to preserve their own life? What was it that commanded them to this? *The God of nature!* (Applause.) The God of nature, when he saw that they were like to starve to death, commanded them to “butcher” their children, and they actually did butcher them. Has the God of the Bible done anything worse than that? No, sir. The God of nature has shown himself to be altogether as guilty as the God of the Bible; and if my friend Wright is true to his declaration, he will have to take his knife and cut the throat of his God of nature. “The God of nature,” he says, “never did send earthquakes to kill men—earthquakes are natural omens.” They are then the *natural actions*, I suppose, of the God of nature; are they? If it is not understood in this way, I confess myself incapable of telling how it is understood.

MR. WRIGHT—My remark is, that earthquakes are the effects of natural causes.

MR. STORRS—Who constituted those natural causes? (Applause.) The God of nature, I suppose. (Applause.) Does his God escape? “The God of nature, in these natural causes, did not kill these inhabitants in these cities; oh no—they only put themselves right across where his car came!” But, sir, the God of nature drove his car right through their cities, and never gave them the least notice that he was coming. Surely that was almost as bad as going into the draw at Norwalk. (Laughter.) This God of nature having established in his works, natural causes, which produce earthquakes that will swallow up cities if they happen to be planted in a certain place, if he was a good God, one would seem to think that he would have sent some notice to the children of men, and

tell them not to build the city, for his car of an earthquake was going to plow through there. But, sir, he leaves them in total ignorance, and allows them to plant their cities, and go on to great happiness and prosperity; and then, without a solitary warning, the God of nature drives his plow of destruction through their streets.

But our friend Wright is very accommodating to the God of nature. If he were half as accommodating to the God of the Bible, he would not find so much difficulty. I should like to know what can be found in that manifestation of the God of nature that goes to prove his goodness. Can the God of nature speak to men really in any way possible? If he can, why did he not give them some notice that he was going to destroy such a section of country, and that therefore they must move away from it, else he would destroy their lives? How good he must be to destroy all their labors, and destroy their families! "But the man would not have been hurt when the lightning fell from heaven, if he had not been in the way of it." Indeed he would not! But did the God of nature tell him, when he was walking along, that he was going to get in the way below? Did he not suffer him to go on, and dash him to death in a moment?

Now, suppose we should make such a defence of the God of the Bible. The God of the Bible, when he divided the earth among the children of men, divided a certain portion to the children of Israel. He determined to establish that people in that land; but here is another class of men that come along, and plant themselves down in the land of Canaan, to possess the land that God had designed for a particular people. Instead of keeping their own inheritance, they plant themselves there in that land. The time comes when the God of the Bible is determined to put his people in possession of the land which he reserved for them at the creation.

Now, sir, what does he do? Why, it is true he does not send an earthquake through the land, and take them all by surprise. Did he give them no notice of what he is going to do? At first, he waited until their corruption was such, in wickedness, that they were no longer to be endured. He had previously informed Abraham (see Gen. 15 : 16) that the reason why he would not at an earlier period cut off the intruders in Canaan was, that "their iniquity was not yet full." But when it was full, and God's purpose to put Abraham's seed in possession of the long-promised land was now to be accomplished, he does not take them by

surprise; he gives them forty years' notice that he is going to dispossess them. And during that forty years he performs certain miracles or actions which were designed to convey to the inhabitants of the land that fact, that the God of the Bible was determined to bring a people in there, to whom that land belonged. He gave them timely notice of it; and they who were believing saved their lives, as Rahab and her family. But all did not believe. Suppose, then, that he commissioned His people to destroy that people out of the land, has he done any thing worse than the God of nature, who destroyed the cities we spoke of? The question is not whether we can defend the God of the Bible, but whether he can be defended in view of the law by which he is to be tried. We might make the same remark in regard to pestilence.

Our friend Wright told us that this, too, was a natural affair; but suppose it is a natural affair—suppose it is in the course of nature, I ask again, who controls that course of nature? Is it the God of nature? and if so, I ask if the God of nature is not chargeable with this terrible crime of sweeping millions of the human race away by the most desolating pestilence?

Just here, at this point, I beg leave to be permitted to read a little from some eminent men on the other side of the question. The names of Hume and Bolingbroke are well known by my friends on the opposite side of the question. Here let me say, that I do not despise any man for being a Deist. I do not use the term Deist ever reproachfully. It is simply one who rejects what we denominate revelation. He believes in God, and revelations of the God of nature. I can not wonder that there are so many Deists in the world, when they suppose that the God of the Bible will do certain things which are attributed to him. I wonder that the whole world are not Deists under the theology in which we have been trained.—(Hear, hear.) But if we have the time, we will show that these most objectionable doctrines, which have led so many into the rejection of revelation, have no foundation in the Bible. [The speaker read from Mr. Hume's "Essay on Providence and the Future State," as found in "Dr. McCulloh's Analytical Investigations concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures," vol. i., p. 97.]

"Allowing the gods to be the authors of the existence or order of the universe, it follows that they possess that precise degree of *power, intelligence, and benevolence which appears in their workmanship*; but nothing further can be proved, except we call in the assistance of exaggeration and flattery, to supply the defects of argument and reasoning. So far as the traces of any attributes at pre-

sent appear, so far we conclude that these attributes exist. *The supposition of further attributes is mere hypothesis*; much more the supposition that, in distant regions of space, or periods of time, there has been, or will be, a more magnificent display of those attributes, and a scheme of administration more suitable to such imaginary virtues."

Last night we were told to remember that the Bible says *yea*, and the Bible says *nay*. Now Mr. Hume, who is a Deist, says *yea*, and then the Deist here says *nay*; then their theology may be called in question as well as ours. [W^R. WRIGHT—To be sure.] And who shall decide? That is the question exactly. (Hear, hear.)

Again, Mr. Hume says: "The great source of our mistake in this subject, and of the unbounded license of conjecture which we indulge, is, that we tacitly consider ourselves as in the place of the Supreme Being, and conclude that he will, on every occasion, observe the same conduct which we ourselves, in his situation, would have embraced as reasonable and eligible. But besides that, the ordinary course of nature may convince us that almost everything is regulated by principles and maxims very different from ours; besides this, I say, it must evidently appear contrary to all rules of analogy, to reason from intentions and projects of man to those of a being so different, and so much superior. In human nature there is a certain experienced coherence of designs and inclinations, so that, when from any fact we have discovered one intention of any man, it may often be reasonable from experience to infer another, and draw a long chain of conclusions concerning his past or future conduct. But this method of reasoning can never have place with regard to a being so remote and incomprehensible (as God), who bears much less analogy to any other being in the universe than the sun to a waxen taper, and who discovers himself only by some faint traces or outlines, beyond which we have no authority to ascribe to him any attribute or perfection."

Lord Bolingbroke, in his Works, vol. iv., pp. 87, 88, says: "We are made able to arrive, by a proper exercise of our mental faculties, from a knowledge of God's works, to a knowledge of his existence, and of that infinite power and wisdom (intelligence) which are demonstrated to us in them. Our knowledge concerning God goes no further." Lord B. continues:—"We are in absolute ignorance of the real essence and inward constitution of every sensible object. How much less reason is there to expect any knowledge of the manner of the being, nature, and essence of the invisible God, or of his physical and moral attributes, beyond what his works, the effects of his nature and attributes, communicate to us? This degree, this sufficient degree of knowledge concerning God, is a fixed point, on one side of which lies Atheism, and metaphysical and theological blasphemy too often on the other."

Now I ask the congregation who have heard this morning, whether one Deist does not say *yea*, and the other *nay*—whether the God of nature is

not as much at variance with himself as the God of the Bible?

There is one other point that I shall notice in the remarks of my friend Wright this morning, particularly. He tells us that Jesus was good—a good man. Thank him for that. He says that Jesus founded a sect. Any harm in that, friend Wright? [M^R. WRIGHT—Yes.] Very well, how did he found it? In any other way than you are founding a sect now? [M^R. WRIGHT—Yes.] No. Well, but what of that? Was the sect good at the outset? Yes; my friend Wright acknowledged that the persons concerned in it, at the outset, were good men. [M^R. WRIGHT—Yes.] I thank him. The men that were first concerned in founding this sect were good men, true men, faithful men, Christ-like men; and they demonstrated their integrity to the truth, by contending for the truth even unto death, at the hazard of their lives. What then? Since that period this sect have become corrupt, and done certain things injurious to society. I am rather glad my friend Wright said, that "those who *assume* to be this sect have had an injurious influence upon the world." Don't you say so, brother Wright?

M^R. WRIGHT—M^R. Chairman, if it is proper to answer, I may answer; but yes or no would not express what I should want to say. I meant this, that those who profess to be guided by the spirit of Jesus, but have no more affinity to that spirit than Satan has, have perpetrated the foulest crimes. I do not believe that a man under the guidance of the spirit that Jesus had would ever commit those horrible sins.

M^R. STORRS—He says these men do not belong to Jesus. What, then, have they to do in pouring contumely upon this sect, or the system Jesus introduced? Why bring them to this stand, when he says himself that they have no affinity to Jesus? He has given us the argument. He has told us that Jesus was good—that the men to whom he committed this work were good and true men. He has now told us that those who *assume* to be of that class act just as contrary to Jesus and his first ministers, as Satan does to God. I will use the expression for him, although I do not know that he used it.

I will not now stop to investigate the fact whether Jesus did found a sect or not; but if he did found one, I ask upon what principles he founded it? My friend Wright will not deny but that the principles were right. He says that he was a man. Very well; suppose he was nothing but a man, then could he foresee that such glorious principles as he laid down would be corrupted and perverted, and entirely departed from, on the supposition that he founded a sect?

Now, sir, I ask again, what were the principles upon which he founded that sect? "Ye know," said Jesus, to these very men who were to preach his truth, "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise *lordship* over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so it shall not be among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant," or minister; that is, one to minister to them—to do them that service which they might need for their welfare or happiness; but he charged them most solemnly that they should not exercise lordships over one another, and the Apostle Paul to the Gentiles comes forward, and in writing to the church at Corinth, says: "Not for that we have *dominion* over your *faith*, but are helpers of your joy."

Here, sir, are the principles of the founder—if you will have it so—of this sect; and I ask, sir, if it is not clear and plain that the founder of this sect, if it be a sect, did clearly denounce and condemn the course which those who "assume" to be of this sect have pursued for centuries past? Why, then, sir, are we cited, I ask again, to the wickedness of those *professing* to be of this sect, "who say they are Jews (Christians), but are not—but do lie?" Why are we cited to them as any reproach upon Christianity? "If Jesus was a good man," say you, "he ought to have known just such rascality would have come up." Indeed! but then you say that he was a man. I have answered my friend only on his own ground.

SP I R I T.

"But there is a spirit in man."—Job. 32 : 8.

To determine the import of the term Spirit, under every variety of circumstance in which it may be used in the Sacred Writings, is a task which neither our space nor our design warrant us to undertake.

Treatises commensurate with such a view of the subject already exist, and by a reference to these the reader can easily satisfy himself on those points which lie beyond the limits of the following remarks. Our present object is very simple, and concerns merely the question—*What is the Spirit of Man?* In answering which we are desirous of echoing only the testimony of Scripture, whose verdict we feel bound to regard as for ever decisive. And, as the language of our text is at once positive and direct, we would respectfully submit what appears to us its fair and natural meaning; a meaning, we presume, in strict harmony with the universal deliverances of both the Old and New Testament.

The statement reads: "But there is a Spirit in Man."

Now, the first thing which strikes us here is the evident distinction between the *Spirit* and the *Man*.

To this distinction we wish particularly to call attention, inasmuch as the theory about the human spirit which now floats in the mind of Christendom, is borne up solely through an obstinate disregard of this plain scripture fact.

This will at once appear if we attend for a moment to the difference between the assertion that Man is a Spirit, or spiritual being; and the assertion that man *has* a spirit, a something which, while performing an essential function in his constitution, is not to be regarded as a distinct entity, according to the prevailing notion.

The former of these propositions, it will be seen, is plainly negated by the latter; and as the proof of the one must necessarily be the refutation of the other, we will briefly adduce what seems to us clear and decided evidence in support of the proposition, which affirms, that *the spirit in man is only an attribute of his physical organism, and is in no respect to be regarded as capable of a separate and independent conscious existence.*

And here the term itself claims primary attention. The word Spirit, which, whatever may be the sense attached to it in actual usage, is the English equivalent for the Hebrew *ruach*, and the Greek *pneuma*, both of which, according to lexicographers, radically import *breath*. The term is used in a variety of senses throughout Scripture, but in every case, except when intended as a metaphor, when spoken of *Man*, it is to be held simply as a synonyme for *breath*.

The primary relation which this breath or spirit sustains to man is not intimated in the text, but as both the philosophy and the facts of human existence demonstrate this, we have only to reflect on the state of man when bereft of his breathing powers, or, as orthodox conventionalism would have it, "when his spirit has departed," in order to ascertain the exact nature of the union. Immediately breathing ceases, life is at an end, and all mental and moral faculties at once paralyzed. The function, then, of the breath or spirit in man, is no other than the maintenance of life, his deprivation of it producing the phenomenon we call *death*, which we hesitate not to pronounce complete in relation to all that constituted the sentient being.

Hence seems to have originated the phrase, "breath of life,"—breathing, or the respiration of the electrified air by the lungs, being essential to the life of all flesh (Gen. 6 : 17.)

This being the case, it is certainly not stretching language too far to speak of the breath or spirit as the "vital principle," or life-sustaining power, life being connected with the performance of its functions in the human system.

This will help to account for that class of passages where "spirit," which, as above defined, literally denotes *breath*, is spoken of as *the life itself*, and sometimes even as equivalent to *the whole man*; Man being regarded as consisting of "Soul, Body, and Spirit," or, more simply, as an organised being, kept alive by breathing, the withdrawal of which breath or spirit, resulting in nothing less than the total dissolution or annihilation of his conscious being. Hence Elihu, "If he (the Almighty) set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and

man shall turn again to dust."—Job 34 : 14, 15. And again the Psalmist, "His (man's) breath (or spirit) goeth forth, he returneth to his earth ; in that very day his thoughts perish."—Ps. 146 : 4. So also Solomon, "Then (at death) shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (or breath) unto God who gave it."—Ecc. 12 : 7.

This view of the spirit of man may appear to some as inconsistent with such passages as ascribe to it *personality* and *intelligent* attributes.

To this we can only make the general reply, that though at first sight, inconsistent with some of the language employed, a careful examination of the real import of terms will satisfy an impartial reader, whose mind has not been wholly "spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit," that neither personality nor intelligence are to be attributed to the human spirit ; but, rather, that the "spirit in man," being the principle or power through whose agency, in connection with the mechanical parts of the human organism, intelligence is produced and identity or personality maintained, they are *retorically* predicated of the Spirit itself.

This is clearly established by the fact, that in numerous instances personality and intelligence are alike referred to Soul, Body, and Spirit ; as "my Soul," "my Flesh," "my Spirit ;" so that if it be contended that the "my" in cases where *Spirit* is intended, proves its distinct intelligence and separate identity, then, on the same ground, we are authorised to maintain the essential personality and intelligence of Soul and Body ; and Man, instead of being a simple self-conscious unity, is to be regarded as a *trium compound of consciousnesses* ; which is, only in other words, to say, that man is three distinct persons,—an hypothesis at once unphilosophical, irrational, and unscriptural.

From all, then, which we can discover from the Book, we think we may safely presume that the "spirit in man" and the work it performs in his constitution, while indispensable to his existence and development, is no more independent of the laws which regulate this physical organism, than the liver which secretes bile, or the heart which propels the blood through his veins.

At this conclusion we can imagine many "orthodox believers" to start back in absolute despair, while the exclamations "infidelity" and "atheism" sound forth the pious horror which possess them at the thought, which divests man's nature of that mysterious and God-like principle, of which his future existence is supposed only to be predicable.

To such we would say, pause and reflect. The truth is even as we have said. But then—what then? Certainly not Despair! Not Infidelity! Not Atheism! Nay! If infidelity or atheism exist, it is all on the other side. For what is our position? Why this: That the popular grounds on which the hopes of futurity are reared, are altogether false and unscriptural!

Yea, and further, that till the delusion is dispelled, the mass of professed believers are without the shadow of a shade of evidence that there shall be any future state at all.

Platonic, or may we not rather say Satanic?—arguments, endorsing the "immortality of the Soul" or the "indestructibility of Spirit," may be

adduced—Gen. 3 : 4, 5 ; but beyond this the creeds of Christendom at present think it not expedient to pass.

Infidelity, forsooth! Yes, 'tis, alas! too patent to be denied, for, what with immortal Soul and Spirit-ism, and other kindred creations of the pagan mind, Bible testimony is hushed—her august deliverances on the nature and destiny of Man silenced, and the groundless speculations of "divines" substituted in their room.

But this must end. The Bible is struggling to be heard again : and to aid her emancipation from the thralldom of the bigotry and intolerance under which she has been groaning during these centuries of darkness and superstition, we would here echo her voice on behalf of a mortal and death-doomed race—by announcing RESURRECTION and LIFE, as Heaven's one grand pledge for the redemption of humanity,—when, from the dark confines of oblivion the conqueror of Hades shall summon the candidates for "GLORY, HONOR, AND IMMORTALITY!"

J. H. S.

Moncrieff's Expositor.

PRAYER.

BY GEO. HILL, MERIDETH, N. Y.

The Object and Efficacy of Prayer.

The object of prayer is understood by a knowledge of prayer. Prayer consists of adoration and supplication. These united constitute true worship. Therefore the great object of prayer is to "worship God."

In proof of the assertion that prayer consists of adoration and supplication let us examine the Lord's prayer. The expression, "hallowed be thy name," is the highest form of adoration—the sentence, "thy will be done," is the purest expression of praise ; and the request, "give us this day our daily bread," is the most humble, confiding and child-like supplication.

Having thus investigated the object of prayer, we come now to consider the efficacy of prayer. As its object is understood by a knowledge of prayer, so is its efficacy.

The efficacious power of prayer is in accordance with the spirit of supplicating love. If ye forgive not, neither can ye be forgiven. The reason why men ask and receive not, is because they ask not in the spirit of prayer. Praying always, is to maintain the spirit of supplicating in love, and of trusting in hope, and believing with confidence. If we possess the spirit of prayer, when we supplicate the forgiveness of our sins, we "shall obtain mercy ;" and if we ask for "daily bread," it shall be "measured" to us according to our willingness to bestow on others. Therefore, "give to him that asketh," and do as you would have it done unto you : for so shalt thou receive, according to thy trustworthiness.

The christian spirit of prayer is to do to others in the same manner as ye would have it done to you, and to be as ye would have others be. This spiritual principle is that which produceth a reward, and also determines the kind of reward. God will grant all righteous requests made in the spirit of prayer, even to the plucking up of a mountain ; and to ask in faith is to ask with that un-

derstanding of heart which would make the request a righteous one. We can never pray to God for that which is not in accordance with his will, because prayer is the desire of faith. Hence we conclude that the efficacy of prayer produceth a blessing.

From Dr. A. G. Case.

ZENAS, Ind., March 11, 1854.

BR. STORRS—I suppose you are not aware that it has been my practice to preach occasionally as duty requires. I endeavor, so far as I am able, to present in its purity the same gospel that Paul preached; viz: *Eternal life through Jesus Christ by the resurrection from the dead.* And I think my labors have been blessed of God to some extent.—While in Illinois last autumn, I attended an Universalist meeting, appointed for the exchange of views on the Scriptures. Professing to be a Bible loving people, they invited me to give my views of Scripture on the subject of Salvation; and I gave them a brief outline as commonly held by us. I spoke about fifteen minutes. Their preacher replied; and the result was a debate, in which he spoke twice and I three times. When I closed my last speech, he did not reply; so that closed the concern. I heard that he acknowledged himself beaten; but said it was because I made the attack from a new and unguarded point. He may well call it an “unguarded point,” for so it is, and ever must be with them. An interest was awakened there on that occasion which, I am informed, still continues to live.

When I came here, the subject of the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked was entirely a new idea to the people, with now and then an exception. I have not seen but two who had ever thought of it. One of them said he had been strongly inclined that way for some time, but had said nothing about it. He is a member of the M. E. Church, and preaches sometimes. He has now put his hand to the plow, and says he has counted the cost and does not intend to look back. Amen.

I preached twice in this neighborhood, about three weeks ago, in a school-house: had more hearers than the house would hold—mixture of Baptists and Methodists. Met with some opposition, especially from the Baptists; but, notwithstanding, some of both churches are beginning to say they “see men as trees walking;” while others declare themselves satisfied that the sentiments preached are in accordance with the word of Divine Truth.

From Freeman Dillingham.

WEST BREWSTER, MASS., April 4, 1854.

BR. STORRS:—I was very sorry to hear of your loss by fire. I feel more interest in your periodical than in any one that I ever before have taken. The Life and Death theme—which you present before your readers—is the lever that will, under the blessing of God, finally triumph in putting down the popular doctrine of inherent immortality. I hope, my brother, that you will not at all be discouraged, but still go on and proclaim, “No immortality or endless life except through Jesus Christ.” I am more than ever convinced that the

popular churches, a majority of them, do not wish to hear or read anything on the subject; the ministry, because it is not popular with the people of their charge; and they would be quite likely to lose their support,—so they must be feeling the pulse of their churches and congregations, to know what will interest and suit them.

From an Old Man.

DEAR SIR—I had Storrs' Six Sermons some years ago. He preached at Ballston Springs; I heard him; got his Six Sermons, perused them, compared them with the Bible, and became a believer in the destruction of the wicked.

I am now in my 70th year; my health is poor, and time with me is short. I have been a member of the First Baptist Church in Stillwater more than fifty years. I still want more light on the Scriptures. If books on this subject were distributed in this section they would inform men, and would no doubt do good. I have not the means, only to a very limited extent, and therefore can do but little. I have Dobney on Future Punishment, and Blain's book, which I have lent freely to my neighbors. In some instances they have been read and compared with the Bible, and some are rejoicing in believing the truth. I lent Dobney's work to our former minister, who kept it, I should think, two months. When I called for it he had not read it at all. Some men are, as in ancient times, not willing to come to the light, lest their deeds should be reproved; and some are so attached to men's creeds and traditions—they do not seem to wish anything better; in fact, they seem to think there is nothing better. I lay this subject before all the ministers where I have opportunity; but of all men to be converted I think them the hardest, but when they are converted I hope they will strengthen their brethren. Mr. —, from New York, put up with me for a night some time ago; I endeavored to cite passages of Scripture to him respecting the destruction of the wicked; he told me it was not the destruction of the being, but of the well-being. But I read, “that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil:” I think the Apostle in this passage is very explicit. *Destroy him*,—and then telling who *him* is, “that is, the devil.” Also the Man of Sin, being personified, is to be destroyed. I think the word destroyed, in the Scriptures, means what it says; and to look over the scripture terms made use of in the Bible, does seem so plain—when applied to the wicked—I wonder how men, bearing the high or flattering titles given them by men, such as Rev. or D. D., can pass over them all, and say, they mean something else,—when it is said, thou shalt die—burn up—chaff cast into the fire—perish—utterly perish—devoured them—whose end is destruction—whose end is to be burned—devour the adversaries—second death. We know if continuation in misery was the meaning, it would have been set forth by different terms and expressions; but it seems to me the difficulty is in the belief that mortal man is immortal, that the soul cannot die—deathless spirit—and such like men-made expressions are put for Scripture; and our teachers have

taught us so—our traditionists think it is so; and how few look for themselves; they call some man, Father and Master; and are content not to search the Scriptures to see what is truth. Farewell.

DANIEL MUNGER.

Stillwater, Saratoga Co., N. Y.

Thoughts on Texts.

"For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."—1 Thess. 5: 9, 10.

The last part of this verse has been made to support the popular theory of a state of consciousness for the disembodied soul. A superficial reader, or one who detached this text from the scope of the Apostle's discourse, might, with his educational pre-conceptions, so interpret the passage. A careful consideration, however, of these words, in connection with the current reasoning of the Apostle, would conduct to a very different conclusion. In the previous chapter, Paul had been describing the circumstances of our Lord's second coming, for the comfort of certain bereaved Thessalonian believers, who seem to have imagined that those who should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," would have considerable advantages above those who were deceased. Paul assures them that these "shall not prevent (precede) them which are asleep;" that, on the contrary, "the dead in Christ shall rise first," and they who are "alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air," and so "ever be with the Lord." In allusion to what he had there been saying, Paul assures these Thessalonians that neither will have the advantage over the other with respect to immediate vision of the Lord and enjoyment of immortality—"Whether we wake or sleep," be among the living or the dead—is of no moment; Christ died for us that, be the case as it may, "we should live together with him" AT HIS COMING.

And thus Dr. Bloomfield, in his Greek Testament, expounds this text—"It is meant that whether we be alive or dead *that day*, it matters not; the living with Christ, or enjoying eternal happiness with him, shall be *equally* our portion."—*Editor Ch. Exr.*

"That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises."—*Heb.* 6: 12.

Some read this passage as if it affirmed that the departed saints, as disembodied spirits, were in the enjoyment of their heavenly rewards. But this cannot be its meaning, for such an exposition is plainly forbidden by a comparison with a subsequent place in this epistle. What this text asserts is, that there are those whose faith and patience have placed them in the company of them who inherit the promises—not the fulfillment of the promises, but the promises to be at a future time fulfilled. And hence this same epistle informs us, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises," that is the fulfillment of them. (*Heb.* 11: 13.) And again, "These all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us,

that they without us should not be made perfect." *Heb.* 11: 39, 40.—*Ibid.*

"TRANSLATION OF *MATT.* 16: 26."—Such is the heading of a short article in the *Advent Harbinger*, for April 8th, credited to *New York Chronicle*. We happen to know the origin of that article; and if the editor of the *Harbinger* had looked into the *EXAMINER* for Feb. 1st, he might have guessed its origin. Two copies of the *EXAMINER*, containing the original, were sent, by special request, to the *Chronicle*, from our office, and that paper copied the first part of it, with some trifling alterations—taking the above head-line, instead of ours, which was "MODERN DIVINITY." We were glad that the *Chronicle* published it in any form, and have no fault to find with it. The *Harbinger* also liked the taste of our neighbor, it seems, better than ours, and we have no right to complain of that. The truth goes, and we rejoice. If some cannot confess it openly, let them work in any way they like best: we claim that right, and mean to accord it to others. Perhaps Br. Marsh, when he comes to see the remainder of our article, from which the *Chronicle's* was an extract, will think well enough of it to give it in the *Harbinger*.

DONATIONS to our aid since April 1st:—Christian F. Bessenger, \$2; Wm. Appleyard, \$1; R. G. B. Woodard, \$1; three ladies in Philadelphia, \$5 each; Freeman Dillingham, \$5; Henry Utley, \$5; friends in Utica, by C. Swartwout, \$7.

All these friends will accept our most unfeigned thanks for their kind remembrance of us. May the Lord enrich them all, more and more, with that grace which shall fit them for usefulness here and a part in His Kingdom, when He, "who was rich and for our sakes became poor," shall return in His glory with the holy angels.

If they could, any of them, send us new subscribers, for the present volume, with the pay in advance, it would relieve us to nearly the same amount as a donation, and be scattering the knowledge of the theme we advocate.

THE *EXAMINER* for April 1st was delayed by unavoidable circumstances, in going to press, nearly a week after it was put in type; in consequence of that delay, the present number is also behind time. We hope to be "up to time" in our issues soon.

"THE GREAT PROJECTS OF FRANCE."—The tract from which the article on this theme was taken, was written some months since, and seems now to be hastening to a fulfillment.